

Re: Status update

Bob Benson to: Brattin, Bill

06/29/2012 10:12 AM

From: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US
To: "Brattin, Bill" <brattin@srcinc.com>
Cc: David Berry/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

I think we have to base the JEM on the arithmetic means. We can't treat this "chemical" different from all the rest.

I don't understand how a variance-weighted model would work for fitting the IH data. We are working with individual data points. How do you derive a variance term from a single value? Why don't you like the results?

I am OK fitting each data set individually.

I would like their rationale for the opinion that the high concentrations in short duration samples is not a problem. We should also investigate the sample dates. Are most of the long duration samples taken after 1980 when Libby ore was not being used. See also the plot that Danielle derived from the IH data (I think only track unload).

I am OK excluding the high value from the background data set.

I am happy that they agree with your approach for adjusting for vermiculite source.

I can do a conference call at the suggested times on July 17 and 23.

Did you send Danielle's email with Question 2 and 3 included verbatim?

We can discuss all of this on Monday.

"Brattin, Bill" ---06/28/2012 11:42:45 AM---I talked to UC today. Here are highlights

From: "Brattin, Bill" <brattin@srcinc.com>
To: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: David Berry/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 06/28/2012 11:42 AM
Subject: Status update

I talked to UC today.
Here are highlights

- 1) They still think GM is better than AM, and show little tendency to be convinced otherwise. However, they agree doing calcs based on AM is one option.
- 2) They agree that fitting IH data by year to an exponential is good, but they recommend using a variance-weighted fitting. I have done this, and I do not like the results. This will need more discussion.

3) The prefer fitting each data set individually, and not forcing the b terms to be equal. That is OK with me.

4) They are not convinced that the high concentration values in short duration samples is a problem, and even if it were, they do not think anything can be done. I suggested a sensitivity calc to see what would happen if these samples were excluded, and they agreed it might be informative. We both expect the impact would be small.

5) They agree the one very high value in the background data set should be excluded as an outlier

6) They agree with the way I adjusted for vermiculite source (i.e., they agree with the method for creating the JEM)

Jim and Grace will be gone to Alaska for 2 weeks, starting tomorrow. Here are times they suggest for a call with EPA when they get back:

Monday 7/16 11:30 -2 pm EST

Monday 7/23 10-Noon EST

Bill Brattin
SRC, Inc.
999 18th Street Suite 1150
Denver CO 80202
Phone: 303-357-3121
Fax: 303-292-4755
e-mail: brattin@srcinc.com<mailto:brattin@syrres.com>

[attachment "winmail.dat" deleted by Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US]